



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,321	08/26/2003	Susumu Kinoshita	21.1997-C	2029
21171	7590	01/31/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				DIACOU, ARI M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3663		

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/647,321	KINOSHITA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ari M. Diacou	3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 35-43 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 40,43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 35-39,41 and 42 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 40 and 43 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 1-12-2006.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1-12-2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the restriction/election requirement is moot, and that claims 35-43 do not belong to invention I. By the applicant's election though, claims 40 and 43 have been withdrawn as being drawn to a no elected invention. For this reason, *inter alia*, the restriction/election requirement is deemed proper.

Drawings

3. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the symbol indicating a pump source diode (#4) in figures 5, 6, 7b, and 10 is presently oriented incorrectly and could be confused with a photodiode. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement filed 8-26-2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. The non-complying references have been stricken-through on the IDS.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 35-40 and 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Inagaki (USPAP No. 2002/0114066).

- Regarding claim 35, Inagaki discloses an optical amplifier comprising:
 - a plurality of optical amplification mediums; [Fig. 13, #200 & #242] [¶ 0123 - 0125]
 - a gain controller to *maintain a constant gain for the plurality of optical amplification mediums*; [Fig. 13, #250] [¶ 0123 - 0125]

- and a gain-equalizer positioned after each optical amplification medium to equalize the gain-characteristic of the optical amplification mediums, the optical amplification mediums being provided in series such that each gain equalizer equalizes the gain characteristic of a preceding optical amplification medium. [Fig. 13, #252 and #254] [¶ 0123 - 0125]
- Regarding claim 36, Inagaki discloses an optical amplifier according to claim 35, wherein the gain equalizers have nearly the same gain characteristic. [Fig. 14] [¶ 0126 - 0127]
- Regarding claim 37, Inagaki discloses an optical amplifier according to claim 35, wherein the optical amplifier mediums have nearly even gain characteristics. [Fig. 14] [¶ 0126 - 0127]
- Regarding claim 38, Inagaki discloses an optical amplifier according to claim 35, wherein the optical amplification mediums are made of erbium doped fibers. [Fig. 13, #252 and #254] [¶ 0123 - 0125]
- Regarding claim 39, Inagaki discloses an optical amplifier according to claim 35, wherein the constant gain of the optical amplification mediums is associated with an inversion ratio of about .8 to about 1.0 within the amplification medium. [Fig. 11, #88] [The examiner considers this gain profile to be constant]
- Regarding claim 42, Inagaki discloses an optical amplifier according to claim 35, wherein each gain equalizer attenuates gain at a peak wavelength. [Inherent, since no tunable filter can attenuate evenly over the continuum of electromagnetic frequencies, nor can it have an infinite attenuation at any

frequency, therefore all filters must therefore attenuate at one frequency more than others, and thus, every filter in an optical amplifier attenuates gain at a peak wavelength.]

7. The italicized clauses are essentially method limitations or statements or intended or desired use and are being examined as if the apparatus were capable of performing the functions described in said clauses. The applicant is claiming an apparatus, not a method or process. Thus, these claims as well as other statements of intended use do not serve to patentably distinguish the claimed structure over that of the reference. See In re Pearson, 181 USPQ 641; In re Yanush, 177 USPQ 705; In re Finsterwalder, 168 USPQ 530; In re Casey, 512 USPQ 235; In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458; Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2nd 1647.

See MPEP § 2114 which states:

A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from the prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2nd 1647

Claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than functions. In re Danly, 120 USPQ 528, 531.

Apparatus claims cover what a device is not what a device does. Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528.

As set forth in MPEP § 2115, a recitation in a claim to the material or article worked upon does not serve to limit an apparatus claim.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki as applied to claim 35 above, and further in view of Kitagawa (USPAP No. 2003/0142407). Inagaki discloses the invention with all the limitations of claim 35, but

fails to disclose a gain equalizer that operates in the S-band. Kitagawa teaches the use of an S-band gain flattening filter in the use of an optical amplifier system [Fig. 11, #105]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art (e.g. an optical engineer) at the time the invention was made, to use an S-band gain flattening filter in order to equalize gain between 1490 and 1530 nm, for the advantage of increased control of the gain spectral profile.

Conclusion

12. While patent drawings are not drawn to scale, relationships clearly shown in the drawings of a reference patent cannot be disregarded in determining the patentability of claims. See In re Mraz, 59 CCPA 866, 455 F.2d 1069, 173 USPQ 25 (1972).
13. The references made herein are done so for the convenience of the applicant. They are in no way intended to be limiting. The prior art should be considered in its entirety.
14. The prior art which is cited but not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
15. As to limitations which are considered to be inherent in a reference, note the case law of In re Ludtke, 169 U.S.P.Q. 563; In re Swinehart, 169 U.S.P.Q. 226; In re Fitzgerald, 205 U.S.P.Q. 594; In re Best et al, 195 U.S.P.Q. 430; and In re Brown, 173 U.S.P.Q. 685, 688.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ari M. Diacou whose telephone number is (571) 272-5591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on (571) 272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMD 1/23/2006

JACK KEITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER